DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY



U.S. Army Corps of Engineers WASHINGTON, D.C. 20314-1000

REPLY TO ATTENTION OF:

CEPR-P (715)

0 3 OCT 1996

MEMORANDUM FOR COMMANDER, ALL MAJOR SUBORDINATE COMMANDS, DISTRICT COMMANDS, FIELD OPERATING ACTIVITIES, AND LABORATORIES, ATTN: DIRECTORS/CHIEFS OF CONTRACTING DIVISION

SUBJECT: PARC Instruction Letter 96-7, Release of Acquisition Information

- 1. Reference Memorandum, SARD-PP, 13 Sep 96, Subject Release of Acquisition Information (enclosed).
- 2. This information is provided for your necessary action.
- 3. POC is Mr. Wes Eubanks, 202-761-8641.

FOR THE COMMANDER:

THOMAS J. QUIGLEY
Colonel, Corps of Engineers
Acting Principal Assistant

Responsible for Contracting



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT AND ACQUISITION 103 ARMY PENTAGON WASHINGTON DC 20310-0103



REPLY TO ATTENTION OF

13 SEP 1996

SARD-PP

MEMORANDUM FOR ARMY ACQUISITION COMMUNITY

SUBJECT: Release of Acquisition Information

During the past several years there has been a trend in the Army and the rest of the government towards providing more-and-more acquisition information to potential offerors. This memorandum pertains to information that is source selection-related, but is not "source selection information" as defined in Section 27 of the OFPP Act (41 USC 423) and FAR 3.104, and which must be protected from disclosure.

This trend to disclosing more-and-more information is the result of statutes, government-wide policy and an evolving recognition at operational levels that a comprehensive disclosure generally results in more responsive proposals. I want to encourage this trend to continue in the Army, and to share with you my thoughts on disclosure of some of the different types of information.

Evaluation Factors and Subfactors. By statute the government must disclose all significant factors and significant subfactors which we reasonably expect to consider in evaluating proposals. I believe we should go beyond what the statute requires. There should be complete disclosure; the evaluation criteria listed in the source selection plan should be included verbatim in the solicitation. The plan itself cannot be released.

Relative Order of Importance. By statute we are also required to state the relative order of importance assigned to all significant factors and subfactors. This is not always done properly in Army solicitations. If we want responsive proposals, we must clearly communicate to offerors what importance we place on the various factors and subfactors. If numerical weights are used, consider disclosing them, at least at the factor level.

Source Selection Officials. In the Army, we don't disclose the identity of the source selection authority or other source selection officials. Cenerally, this is a sound policy. However, there may be instances, such as when offerors will make oral proposals or other presentations, when it is not practicable to maintain the confidentiality of the identity of key source selection officials. In such instances, disclosure is not objectionable.

In the Army we tend to make minimal disclosure of source selection-related acquisition information in order to "retain flexibility." I understand and appreciate the desire for maximum flexibility in a subjective process like source selection. concerned that too often the desire to retain flexibility is, in fact, an unwillingness to take the time and effort to do the hard work of developing a statement of work (SOW) that clearly and accurately reflects the Army's requirement; to determine which of the elements of the SOW are critical and may be used to differentiate between offers and offerors; and to develop evaluation factors and subfactors that pertain to the SOW elements and the way to evaluate them.

My action officer is Mr. Curtis Stevenson, (703) 697-2630, e-mail: stevensc@sarda.army.mil.

Kenneth J. Oscar

Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army

(Procurement)

Comet & Secon